

by the forty gentlemen present, matters being left in this position: The Government hesitated to institute prosecutions, and thought that private individuals should do so.

Meanwhile the campaign went on. Mr. Smith wrote a letter to the newspapers; another came from Lord Mount-Temple; and the press, with few exceptions, endorsed everything that was said by the commoner and the nobleman.

The vigilant "Guardian" of the Church of England availed itself of the occasion to thunder against Sir E. Rieu and his "Arabian Nights"; "The Tablet" of the Roman

Catholics jesuitically signified its approval of the agitation,

because Zola's whole tendency was "suspected" (!) to be immoral; the conscientious Nonconformist journals, as was to be expected, said ditto to everything that Smith said.

Some righteous contributor to "The Globe" wrote of Zola's books that they were characterised by "dangerous lubricity" that they "sapped the foundations of manhood and woman-

hood, not only destroyed innocence, but corroded the moral nature." "The Birmingham Daily Mail" declared that "Zola simply wallowed in immorality." "The Whitehall

Review" openly clamoured for the prosecution of his publisher. "The Weekly Dispatch" impudently inquired, "If

Mr. Vizetelly gives us Zola, why does he *pick* 'La Terre' ?
And if Daudet, why *pick* ' Sapho' ?" — thus ignoring the fact that the firm published virtually all of the former's stories, and several of the latter's, and conveying, for its own purposes, a false impression to its readers. Indeed, misrepresentation of the facts was to be found in many directions.
A few newspapers wrapped themselves in then: dignity and said nothing; and a few remained fairly cool and sensible :